Of

# EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description For Ident.	In Evidenc
None	2690		Map published in 1940 by the Soviet Navy (marked by Witness FUJITA, Masamichi)	23536
None	2691		Certificate from the Director of the Ad- ministration Pivision of the 2nd Demobiliza- tion Bureau accounting for the non-production of certain documents referred to in cross- examination 3 Jun3 1947 (page 23,527 of the	22 542
1623	2681		A Chart of the Approximate State of the Soviet Army's Distribution of Troops in the Soviet East from 1931 onward (previously marked for identification, page 23,453 of the record, 3 June 1947)	23543
1318	2682		Military Power in Manchukuo and Korea (1931 - 1945) (previously marked for identification, page 23,454 of the record, 3 June 1947)	23555
1544	2692		Volume of the Official transcript of the Inter- national Military Tri- bunal at Nurnberg, Germany 2355	7
1544	2692-	-Λ	Excerpt therefrom	23557

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Dec.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
619A-	1 2693		Excerpt from the in- terrogation of Ambassador OSHIMA Hiroshi (exhibit N 776)	No.	23558
1586	2694		Affidavit of NISHIMUF Kumao	RA,	23562
1545	2695		Affidavit of SATO, Na	otake	23575
1465	2696		Telegram No. 893 to A bassador SATO at 1	Am- loscow	23587
1469	2697		Telegram No. 898 to Ambassador SATO at Moscow	t	23587
1466	2698		Telegram No. 1385 fro Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister T	0	23 588
1470	2699		Telegram No. 1417 fro Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister 1	0	23588
1468	2700		Telegram No. 931 to Ambassador SATO at Moscow	t	23588
1467	2701		Telegram No. 932 to Ambassador SATO at	t Moscow	23588
1471	2702		Telegram No. 1449 fro Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister 1	0	23588

Of

# EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros. No. Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1472	2703	Telegram No. 1450 from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO		23590
1473	2704	Telegram No. 1484 from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO		23590
1474	2705	Telegram No. 1530 from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO		23590

## O F

#### WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
FUJITA, Masamichi (resumed)	23533
Cross by General Vasiliev (cont'd)	23533
Redirect by Mr. Blakeney	23538
Recross by General Vasiliev	23544
(Witness excused)	23545
MORNING RECESS	23553
SATO, Naotake	23564
Direct by Mr. Blakeney	23564
NOON RECESS	23574
Direct by Mr. Blakeney (cont'd)	23575
AFTERNOON RECESS	23588
(Witness excused)	23611

- 1	
1	Wednesday, 4 June 1947
2	
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST
5	Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building
6	Tokyo, Japan
7	
8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
9	at 0930.
10	
11	Appearances:
12	For the Tribunal, same as before.
13	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
14	For the Defense Section, same as before.
15	
16	(English to Japanese and Japanese
17	to English interpretation was made by the
18	Language Section, IMTFE.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
25	
24	
85	

W h 0 1 e n & D u đ

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Between 9:30 and 10:45 this morning, the accused TOJO will confer with his counsel, with the Tribunal's permission.

General Vasiliev.

7

9

10

11

12

6

1

3

4

MASAMICHI FUJITA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

13

BY GENERAL VASILIEV:

15

. 14

16

17

18 19

20

22

23 24

Mark in red pencil, using the sign "X" with the figure "l" the place of the sinking of the ship Angarstroy.

Yesterday answering my last question, Mr. Witness, you stated that the Soviet ship, Angarstroy, was sunk on May 1, 1942, by a submarine thirty-six miles off the Japanese coast, but the submarine was allegedly not a Japanese one but either American or British. I ask you to take a look at the map of this area. Can you read this map well? Lo you recognize this area, the area of Soviet coast, Japan, China and Manchuria?

22

23

24

It is not clear to me what is going on in 1 the translations. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: There will be a delay, 3 Mr. President, while the earphones are replaced. 4 THE PRESIDENT: The Japanese reporter will repeat the question. 7 (Whereupon, the last question was 8 read by the Japanese court reporter.) 9 Q Please mark with the sign "X" with the figure 10 "2" in red pencil, the place of the sinking of the 11 Soviet ship Perekop. 12 That cannot be marked on this map. 13 Why? ' Q 14 I think the Perekop was sunk in the South 15 China Sea. 16 And can you find on this map the place of the 17 sinking of the Soviet Diesel ship Maikop? 18 A No. 19 Can you mark on this map the places of the 20 sinking of Soviet ships Kola or Ilmen? I do not know about them. Don't you know that these ships were sunk in February, 1942, in the area of the Korean Strait? Not in my recollection.

Do you see the Sangar Straits on the map?

3

A Yes. Q By closing the Sangar Straits, Japan deprived the USSR of the shortest, most convenient way to the Pacific, didn't she? A Yes. Q Mark with a red line the way to the Pacific 6 from Vladivostok through the Sangar Straits. 7 A. I have so marked. 9 You suggested that Soviet ships should go 10 through the Korean Straits. I will ask you to mark 11 in blue pencil this route from Vladivostok. 12 A I have so marked. 13 Q You also suggested that Soviet ships should 14 pass through Laperouza Straits and Kurilean Straits. 15 Please mark the line along this route in blue pencil 16

THE PRESIDENT: Better put a dotted blue line.

18 19

17

from Vladivostok.

20

21 22

2

This is also a much longer route through the 1 Sangar Straits to the Pacific Ocean, isn't it? 2 I think the question was in error. May I 3 have it repeated? 4 (Whereupon, the question was read 5 back by the Japanese court reporter.) 6 Yes, it will be a longer route than the 7 Straits of Tsugaru. 8 And if we take into consideration that the 9 Laperouza Straits were covered with ice for two, three 10 months, then it becomes quite clear what difficulties 11 were created by the Japanese Government for Soviet 12 navigation, isn't that so? 13 I should think it would be inconvenient. 14 GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer in evidence the 15 map marked by the witness. This map was published in 16 17 1940 by the Soviet Navy. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. 19 MR. BLAKENEY: I, of course, object to its 20 reception in evidence except for the information 21 contained in the markings of the witness. He hasn't 22 identified the map as such.

THE PRESIDENT: It is admitted to that extent,

CLERK OF THE COURT: The map published in 1940

25

23

24

and on the usual terms.

by the Soviet Navy and marked by the witness will receive exhibit No. 2690.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 2690 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I take upon myself to process this map for the Members of the Tribunal and for the defense in a few days.

May I continue my cross-examination, your Honor?

THE PRESILENT: No; not until the Judges have perused the map.

Yes, General Vasiliev.

Q Do you know that as far back as August 25, 1941 the Japanese ambassador to Moscow lodged a protest against a shipment from the U.S.A. to Vladivostok of goods purchased by the Soviet Union?

A I do not know.

Q Do you know that the Japanese Government promised to the German Government, and reported to the German Government, about the measures taken to hinder Soviet navigation in the Pacific Ocean?

A I do not know.

GENERAL VASILIEV: In conclusion of my crossexamination I invite the Tribunal's attention to exhibits

1 2

4

6

7 8

9

10

12 13

14

10

15

17

18

19

21

22

24

No. 79

No. 795-A, 778, 812-A, and exhibits from 813 to 824 inclusive.

MR. BLAKENEY: May I be allowed just a moment to study the map?

#### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q Mr. Witness, calling your attention again to the map, exhibit 2690, will you tell the Tribunal, if you know, the meaning of the heavy black line written on the map running north of Hokkaido and in a northeasterl direction on the western side of the Kuril Islands?

A I do not know who drew this line, but as for myself I cannot explain it.

Greenberg & Leftler

1

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(	Q Has	s that	line,	as i	fer as	you	know,	εny r	e <b>-</b>
lation	n to me	esures	cone	ernir	ng nav	igat:	ion of	those	waters
taken	by the	Japan	nese N	avy d	uring	the	war?		

- A There is no relation.
- Q Will you state to the Tribunal whether navigetion by Russian vessels was permitted through other straits passing between various pairs of the Kurile Islands?
- A There was no limit -- no restrictions to passage through the Chishima Straits -- the straits within the Kurile Islands -- there was no restrictions on passage through the straits within the Kurile Islands.
- Q Then, when you said "Chishima Straits," do you refer to one particular strait or to various straits passing at various points through the archipelago of the Kurile Islands?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Blakeney, the witness did not mention "Chishima Straits." It was corrected.

- A Will you repeat the question again in Japanese?

  THE MONITOR: No. The witness said, "I don't understand the question."
- Q You said there was no restriction on navigation through the Chishima Straits, I believe.
- A I am referring to all the various straits in the archipelago.

Q Will you take the red pencil and mark on this 1 map a heavy, short line through each of those straits which exists? 4 (Whereupon, a pencil was handed to 5 the witness.) 6 There was no limit to passage -- restrictions 7 on passage through any of the straits. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Are they all navigable? 9 THE WITNESS: There are some through which 10 navigation is easy and some through which navigation 11 is very difficult. 12 Q Please take the red pencil again and more 13 carefully mark the heavy line showing each of those 14 possible routes of navigation. 15 THE PRESIDENT: We are having too many red 16 lines. I think we had better start on blue ones. 17 Q Please use this blue grease pencil and make 18 a very heavy mark showing through each of those 19 passages. 20 GENERAL VASILIEV: May I say a few words? 21 THE PRESIDENT: I understand one of my 22 colleagues is protesting at the loss of time involved 23 in marking straits. Both sides asked for these markings. I, personally, would like to know what straits

are navigable. I would like to have them indicated. Some are difficult of navigation according to the witness.

Q Then, if I may ask one more question, I will ask the witness to take the green pencil and mark those passages through the Kuriles which can be said to be easy of navigation, that is, if they are different from the ones marked in blue.

A I am not an expert on navigation. Therefore, I cannot speak of such matters from a technical stand-point.

Q Very well, then, I will leave that.

Now, one or two other questions. In paragraph 10 of your affidavit you speak of instructions which you and your fellow officers received time and again in connection with rescue operations. Since there has been a question raised concerning the form and nature of various instructions, will you please state to the Tribunal what those instructions consisted of and in what form they were?

A That was according to our usual education and training.

THE MONITOR. That is how we were trained and educated from -- at all times.

Q Then, the term "instructions" as used here

. .

are navigable. I would like to have them indicated. Some are difficult of navigation according to the witness.

Q Then, if I may ask one more question, I will ask the witness to take the green pencil and mark those passages through the Kuriles which can be said to be easy of navigation, that is, if they are different from the ones marked in blue.

A I am not an expert on navigation. Therefore, I cannot speak of such matters from a technical stand-point.

Q Very well, then, I will leave that.

Now, one or two other questions. In paragraph 10 of your affidavit you speak of instructions which you and your fellow officers received time and again in connection with rescue operations. Since there has been a question raised concerning the form and nature of various instructions, will you please state to the Tribunal what those instructions consisted of and in what form they were?

A That was according to our usual education and training.

THE MONITOR. That is how we were trained and educated from -- at all times.

Q Then, the term "instructions" as used here

does not refer to specific written or oral instructions on these occasions, is that right?

A That is so.

MR. BLAKENEY: Now, lastly, before the witness leaves the stand, I wish to offer in evidence a certificate from the Director of the Administration Division of the 2nd Demobilization Bureau accounting for the non-production of certain documents referred to in cross-examination yesterday, the documents in question having been inquired about by the Soviet prosecutor on page 23,527 of the record.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I would like the Tribunch to admit this certificate as accounting for the absence of documents, or it doesn't show whether the documents were burned or destroyed.

MR. BLAKENEY: Counsel's translation of the document must be wrong. The document is, as sometimes happens with these certificates, rather inartistically drawn and goes beyond what I consider its proper function of certifying the absence of the document and does state that the documents were burned.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what is happening?

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I have made the tender,
and objection was made.

2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

THE PRISIDENT: I have seen no document, no copies for the Judges.

3

MR. BLAKENEY: The document came into my possession only this morning, and I haven't yet had time to process it.

7

8

5

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is based on a misapprehension, apparently. The certificate says that the documents were burnt in the fire and they are not extant at the present moment.

9

Admitted on the usual terms.

10 11

CLIRK OF THE COURT: The certificate concerning the loss through fire and non-existence of papers will receive exhibit No. 2691.

12

13

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2691 and received in evidence.)

14 15

MR. BLAKENEY: That concludes the redirect

17 18

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

19 20

21

examination.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, in connection with the three new lines marked on the map, I would like to have the permission of the Tribunal to ask three questions of the witness now in the stand.

22 23

THE PRESIDENT: You have our permission.

24

1	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY GENERAL VASILIEV:
3	Q Mr. Witness, before the ships pass through
4	any of the Kurile Straits, they must pass through the
5	Laperouza Straits, isn't that so?
6	A Yes, that is so.
7	Q This is the strait that was opened for
8	Soviet ships during the daytime except in winter
9	when it was covered with ice, isn't that so?
10	RUSSIAN MONITOR: Correction. During the day-
11	time only.
12	A We have not prevented the passage of Soviet
13	ships even at night whenever there were Soviet re-
14	quests. There was a period of two or three months
15	in the winter when passage was impossible.
16	Q You marked blue line through the Kurile
17	Straits and, not being a navigation expert, simply
18	because there is a space between the straits, and
19	

20

22

there or not.

possible.

23

24

25

A Of course, there is some difference in the -generally speaking, there is some difference in the

RUSSIAN MONITOR: Whether the passage was

you marked that line without taking into consider-

ation without the passage of ocean ships was possible

23

24

25

0

cused.)

2

3

difficulty and facility of passage through these straits, but I believe they were all passable.

Q In accordance with my suggestion, you marked a blue line on the northern part, and this blue line corresponds to the line indicated by the Naval General Staff of the USSR, is that so?

I gave it as an instance, because it was known as a regular route used by Soviet ships.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I have no more questions, your Honor.

MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be released on the usual terms.

> THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly. (Whereupon, the witness was ex-

MR. BLAKFNEY: And, in view of the restricted character of the admission into evidence of exhibit 2690, the map, I should like to ask that the internal markings made by the witness be also considered part of the exhibit as admitted.

THE PRISIDENT: As one of my colleagues observed on the previous occasion when we admitted a document of the kind, they are admitted as diagramatic.

MR. BLAKENEY: I now offer in cyidence exhibit 2691 for identification, the Japanese Army

 General Staff chart of the strength of the Soviet Far Eastern Army, identified by Colonel Blake.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I object to the introduction of this document on two grounds.

First, I think that the problem of defensive measures of democratic countries, including the USSR, against the aggressor is irrelevant to the issues involved in this case and does not justify the actions of the accused.

And, second, because this is not a trustworthy document because it is not known when it was
drawn up and by whom it was drawn up. There are no
signatures on the document. And, the fact that the
document was identified by Lieutenant Colonel Blake
is not relevant because it doesn't identify the
contents of the document but merely states that the
document is in the custody of his office and was seen
by him there.

I think that this document can't be admitted on one ground more. In this document, we see
a record of various events and, in connection with
this, the numerical strength of the Soviet Army is
given, including the problems connected with the internal organization of the Soviet Army, and I can't

understand what revelancy this has to the issues involved in the case.

When all these problems are put together, the record of events and the organization of the Soviet Army and the numerical strength of the Soviet Army, all this makes rather peculiar composition.

And, considered in this light, the document is obviously biased. If the Tribunal is interested in the data concerning the armed forces of the USSR in the Far East, I shall be able to supply this data, and I shall supply this data not from the Japanese sources but from the more trustworthy Soviet sources.

On the above-mentioned grounds, I ask the Tribunal to reject the document.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

TR. BLAKENEY: Witness after witness has testified that Japanese military preparations were made with the threat of Soviet military might always in mind. The prosecution witness, SEJIMA, Ryuzo, testified specifically (transcript, page 8,119, et seq.) that Japanese operations plans for the eventuality of war with the USSR were drawn on the basis, partly, of estimates by the Japanese Army of Soviet strength. How can it be doubted that these very estimates, now offered in evidence, are relevant to the issue of who plotted aggression?

As to our not knowing who prepared the document, it has already been testified to be a document of the Japanese General Staff. That will be found on page 23,452 of the record.

Without further arguing whether it should be inadmissible on that ground, I merely call attention to the Charter, article 13-c(1), which provides that a document which appears to the Tribunal to have been signed or issued by any officer, department, agency, or member of the armed forces of any government shall be admissible. This is a document which, on the record as it now

stands, can only appear to the Tribunal to have been issued by an agency of the armed forces of a government and which must, therefore, be admissible. THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled, and the document admitted for what it is worth, on the usual terms. 7 MR. BLAKENEY: From the exhibit I shall read 8 only the first and third columns, the year and the essen-9 tial conditions of military strength, and in reading I 10 shall abbreviate the latter so far as possible. 11 THE PRESIDENT: It shall bear the same number 12 as it had for identification. 13 (Whereupon, the document above referred 14 to, having been previously marked defense exhibit 15 No. 2681 for identification, was received in evidence.) 16 MR'. BLAKENEY (Reading): 17 "A Chart of the Approximate State of the Soviet 18 Army's Distribution of Troops in the Soviet East from 19 1931 onward. 20 "1931, Military Strength about September. 21 "No. of sharpshooter divisions ...... 6 22 "No. of cavalry brigades ..... 2 23 "1932, Military strength about September. 24 "No. of sharpshooter divisions ......8(1) 25 "No. of cavalry divisions ...... 1 "Brigades ......11

	"No. of aircraft200
	"No. of tanks250
	"1933, Military strength about November.
	"No. of sharpshooter divisions8(1)
	"No. of cavalry divisions1
	"Brigades1
	"No. of aircraft350
	"No. of tanks300
	"1934, Military strength about the e.id of
June.	
	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approxi-
ma tel	ly 11
	"No. of cavalry divisions 2
	"No. of aircraft500
	"No. of tanks
	"No. of submarines 14
	"Total manpower, approximately, 230,000
	"1935, Military strength at about the
end c	of the year.
	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approx-
imate	ely 14
	"No. of cavalry divisions, approxi-
matel	y 3
ma ver	
	"No. of aircraft 950
	"Total manpower at least240,000

1	"1936, Military strength at about the
2	end of the year.
3	"No. of sharpshooter divisions 16(4)
4	"No. of cavalry divisions 4
5	"No. of aircraft1200
6	"No. of tanks1200
7	"No. of submarines
8	"1937, Military strength about the end
9	of the year.
10	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approx-
11	imately 20
12	"No. of aircraft, approximately 1560
13	"No. of tanks 1500
14	"No. of submarines 67
15	"Total manpower, approximately, 370,000
16	
17	"1938, Military strength about the end of
18	the year.
19	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approx-
20	imately 24
21	"No. of aircraft, approximately,. 2000
22	"No. of tanks, approximately 1900
23	"No. of submarines 75
24	"Total manpower, approximately, 450,000
25	"1939, Filitary strength about the end of
	the year.

1	"No of sharpshooter divisions approx
1	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approx-
2	imately 30
3	"No. of aircraft, approximately 2500
4	"No. of tanks, approximately 2200
5	"No. of submarines 90
5	"Total manpower, approximately570,000
7	"1940, Military strength about the end
3	of the year.
)	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approx-
)	imately 30
Ĭ	"No. of aircraft 2800
	"No. of tanks 2700
	"No. of submarines 103
	"Total manpower, approximately, 700,000
	"1941, Military strength at about the
	end of the year.
	"No. of sharpshooter divisions, approx-
	imately 23
)	"No. of aircraft, approximately, 1000
	"No. of tanks, approximately, 1000
2	"No. of submarines 105
	"Total manpower, approximately, 800,000
	"1942, Military strength at about the end
	of the year.
	"No. of sharpshooter divisions,

	approximately 20
1	"No. of aircraft, approximately 1000
2	"No. of tanks, approximately, 8001000
3	"No. of submarines 105
5	"Total manpower, approximately 750,000
6	"1943, Troop strength at about the end of
7	the year.
8	"No. of sharpshooter divisions,
9	approximately 19
10	"No. of aircraft, approximately 1100
11	"No. of tanks, approximately, 8001000
12	."No. of submarines 108
13	"Total manpower, approximately 700,000"
14	And I read the remarks at the bottom, page 5.
15	"REMARKS: The total manpower and the number
16	of aircraft under the main military strength column
17	includes that of the whole Red Army, the Red Navy
18	and the Department of the People's Commissariat for
19	Internal Affairs.
20	"Numbers of aircraft indicate those that are
21	equipment of operational units and do not include
22	training, transport or liaison planes."
23	THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen
24	minutes.
25	(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was
	,

```
taken until 1100, after which the
1
            proceedings were resumed as follows:)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

document.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

IR. BLAKENEY: I now offer in evidence exhibit 2682 for identification, the Japanese Army General Staff Table of Japanese military strength in Manchoukuo and Korea for the years 1931 to 1945. This document was likewise identified by Colonel Blake, page 23,454 of the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Exhibit No. 2682 has been marked as received in evidence and retains the same exhibit number.

(Whereupon, defense exhibit No. 2682 for identification received exhibit No. 2682 and was received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I shall read the entire

"Military Power in Manchukuo and Korea (1931 - 1945)

"August 17th, 1946, General Affairs Section

"Year	Manchoukuo	Korea
"1931	64,900	30,500
"1932	94,100	30,500
"1933	114.100	301500

	"1934	144,100	30,500
	"1935	164,100	30,500
	"1936	194,100	30,500
	"1937	200,000	35,700
	"1938	220,000	35,400
	"1939	270,000	35,400
	"1940	400,000	27,000
	"1941	700,000	45,700
	"1942	700,000	42,000
	1943	600,000°	59,000
	"1944	460,000	68,000
	"1945"	I hope this ty	pographical error
is con	rrected in al	1 copies	
		784,600	260,800
	"Note: T	he above are ba	sed on investigation
made	at the end of	each year and	are round numbers."
	Some evid	ence on the que	estions of neutrality
and no	eutrality pac	ts has already	been offered on
Thurs	day last out	of logical sequ	mence owing to court-
room	exigencies.		
	Resuming	that subject I	shall now turn to
evide	nce of the ur	gings by the Ge	erman Government that
Japan	enter the wa	r against the U	JSR. I tender
first	for identifi	cation a volume	e of the official
tanna	orint of the	International I	Military Tribunal

at Nurnberg, defense document 1544 and offer in evidence the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same document number and consisting of a passage from

the testimony of Joachim von Ribbentrop on the

30th of March 1946.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document
1544, being the official transcript of the International
Military Tribunal sitting at Nurnberg, Germany, will
receive exhibit No. 2692 for identification only;
and the excerpt therefrom will receive exhibit No.
2692-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2692 for identification; the excerpt therefrom being marked defense exhibit No. 2692-A and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the document.

"Testimony of Joachim von Ribbentrop

"After the outbreak of the German-Russian war, I also tried to have Japan attack Russia, for in such a way I saw a quick ending of the war.

Japan, however, did not do that. Rather I should say, she did neither the one thing we wanted nor the other, but she did do a third thing. She attacked

1 2

Ribbentrop's statement of the German request and the Japanese refusal to violate the Neutrality Pact is confirmed by the statement of Ambassador OSHIMA in his interrogation, Exhibit 776, as contained in defense document 619-A-1, an excerpt therefrom which I now offer in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 619A-1 will receive exhibit No. 2693.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2693 and received in evidence.) MR. BLAKENEY: I read the document. "Excerpts from the Interrogation of OrHIMA

"Interrogation of 22 April 1946

"Q Do you know the fact that the Kwantung Army, after the attack on Soviet Russia by Germany in the summer of 1941 was in a state of military preparedness for a move against Russia?

"A I know nothing about such a thing. On the contrary, I consider that the German Government always felt dissatisfaction over Japan's making no move against the soviet Union, and on several occasions

21,

we received protests from the German Government regarding our relations with the USSR. The German Government protested against our assurances given to Moscow to effect that Japan was faithful to the Neutrality Pact; on several occasions thereafter we received German protests referring to the fact that the Japanese Navy did not effectively prevent the shipment by America of munitions to Vladivostok.

"Q In 1941 and thereafter, what conversations had you with leading German diplomats or soldiers concerning Japan's going to war against the UFFR?

"A About the middle of June 1941, Ribbentrop told me in an unofficial conversation of the desire of the German Army that Japan join in the war against the USSR. I reported the matter to Foreign Minister TOYODA, but received no reply. On several occasions after that in unofficial conversations I was asked by him whether Japan would join the war against Russia. I did not fail to report these unofficial inquiries to my government. Only once did Germany make an official proposal to the Japanese Government that it join the war against the USSR. This was in July of 1942, and the Japanese Government made a negative reply, the substance of which was that Japan was unable to wage a war against the USSR.

its military forces being barely sufficient for the China and Pacific theaters. Germany never thereafter renewed the proposal."

In view of the relationship created by the Neutrality Pact, Japan isisted, at the time of the renewal of the Anti-Comintern Pact, on the abrogation of the secret agreement attached thereto, as will be shown by the evidence now to be introduced. I tender for identification defense document 1571, the exchange of notes between the governments of Japan and Germany regarding abrogation of the secret agreement. It is tendered for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, this document and document 1586 which follows refer to the abrogation of the secret agreement attached to the Anti-Comintern Agreement by an exchange of notes on 25 November 1941 between Japan and Germany. In the interests of saving time, the prosecution is quite willing to stipulate accordingly.

MR. BLAKENEY: Since the documents were to be supported by the testimony of a witness, I was requesting the prosecutor whether he would stipulate to all the testimony contained in the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Would his testimony go beyond the fact of the abrogation?

MR. TAVENNER: It does in one paragraph only, the last paragraph --

THE PRESIDENT: Do you contest that?

MR. TAVENNER (continuing): which I have agreed that counsel read without calling the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The abrogation is admitted. There is no need for this document or the next, and the last paragraph of the affidavit will now be read.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I have not agreed to the correctness of the last paragraph, merely that it be admitted.

MR. BLAKENEY: There are additional facts contained in the affidavit of the witness that I desire to prove, unless admission can be made of those facts also. I do think, on the whole, it would be quicker to read the documents if counsel

can agree to the second and third paragraphs of the affidavit. MR. TAVENNER: I believe we are losing 3 time rather than saving it, your Honor. 4 MR. BLAKENEY: I am afraid we are. I think it will be quicker to introduce the evidence. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Pursue the quickest way. 7 MR. BLAKENEY: I will omit the document 8 already tendered, withdrawing the tender, and I will call the witness NISHIMURA Kumao, whose testi-10 mony is embodied in defense document 1586. Mr. 11 Tavenner says there is no objection to my reading 12 13 the affidavit without calling the witness. I 14 therefore offer it in evidence. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 15 16 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1586 17 will receive exhibit No. 2694. 18 (Thereupon, the document above refer-19 red was marked defense exhibit 2694 and re-20 ceived in evidence.) 21 MR. BLAKENEY: I shall read only the 22 following paragraphs: the second, the third, and 23 the last. 24 "I was in the office of the Chief of the

First Section of the Treaty Bureau from October

Bureau had charge of business concerning the ratification and the promulgation of treaties. I was accordingly concerned, as the competent chief of section, with the procedure for Imperial sanction and promulgation of the Protocol concerning the extension of the validity of the Pact against the Communist International of 25 Novem-

"The secret agreement attached to the Pact against the Communist International was abrogated simultaneously with the signing of that Protocol. This step was taken in accordance with the proposal of the Japanese Government, and the draft which was adopted of the secret official notes exchanged for that purpose was also submitted by the Japanese Foreign Ministry."

I believe I can omit the remainder of that paragraph.

Going now to the last paragraph:

"It was the German Government which, in October 1941, proposed the extension of the term of the Pact against the Communist International. Even before that, during Foreign Minister MATSUOKA's visit to Berlin in March of the same year, Foreign

1 2

7 8

ber 1941.

2

4

5

8

9

10

Minister Ribbentrop had expressed his desire for such prolongation, to which Mr. Matsuoka gave a favorable answer. Mr. MATSUOKA so stated, as I recollect, soon after his return home from Europe, in the course of his explanation of the Japan-Soviet Neutrality Pact to a committee of the Privy Council to which that Pact was referred for ratification."

I now call as a witness SATO, Naotake, whose testimony is contained in his affidavit. defense document 1545.

11

12

13

14

NAOTAKE SATO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

16

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

17

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

19

Q Mr. Witness, please state your name, residence, and occupation.

21

22

20

A The name, SATO, Naotake; my address, No. 755 Koremase, Aza Tamamura, Kita Katama Gun, Tokyo. At present I am a member of the House of Councillors.

23 24

MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be handed defense document 1545.

25

(Thereupon, a document was handed to

the witness.)

I ask you to examine that and state whether it is your affidavit, signed and sealed by you.

A This is an affidavit signed by me.

- Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
- A Yes.

MR. BLAKENEY: The affidavit, defense document 1545, is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

ment representing a group of documents prepared by the defense concerning the circumstances and conditions of the entry of the USSR into the war against Japan on the side of the USA and Great Britain in August 1945.

I have counted for the time being thirteen documents and four affidavits: 1465, 1466, 1467, 1468, 1469, 1470, 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1475, 1476, 1535, 1464, 1537, 1627.

I consider it necessary to make objection to all the documents of this group, and I respectfully ask the Honorable Tribunal to consider this question as irrelevant to the issues involved in this case. I must state that as I do not know what the Tribunal's attitude as regards this ques-

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

tion is, and in view of the importance of the issue, I am going to make a motivated objection as brief as possible, in the interests of saving time.

In the opening statement of the Soviet prosecutor, read on October 8 of last year, it was clearly stated that the Japanese Government, in 1945, had made an attempt to use the mediation of the USSR for the conclusion of peace between Japan, the USA, and Great Britain, but the Soviet Government had refused to do so, and fulfilling its duty of an ally of the USA and Great Britain, had declared war against the Japanese aggressor for the purpose of making Japan unconditionally surrender and ensuring general peace (pages 7283 - 7284 of the transcript).

The Tribunal has an official document, exhibit No. 64, which gives a clear and objective picture of the circumstances under which this question of the relations between the USSR and Japan were settled. This document, together with the Potsdam Declaration (Exhibit No. 2), the Instrument of Surrender (Exhibit No. 6), and Defense documents 1430 and 1624, in which decisions adopted at Teheran, in the Crimea, and Potsdam are contained, gives to the Tribunal an exhaustive and objective

1 2 8

picture of joint actions taken by the USSR, the USA, and Great Britain against Japan as an aggressor, and also a picture of the circumstances of the USSR's entry into the war.

All the documents being now tendered by
the defense have the purpose of unilaterally disputing these historic facts, of criticizing them unobjectively, and of making counter-charges against
the Allied Powers, and the USSR in particular,
with regard to their actions taken against Japan as
an aggressor and for the purpose of ensuring general
peace. We submit that such method of considering
this matter is inadmissible, not to say that it
would burden the Tribunal with unnecessary matters,
and is a waste of valuable time.

Joint actions of the USSR, the USA, and Great Britain against Japan in 1943 (The Teheran Conference, November 1943) through 1945 were measures of the suppression of the aggressor and of the ensuring of general peace. I think there can't be any other opinion except that the decisions taken by the United Nations in Teheran, the Crimea, and Potsdam and expressed in the Instrument of Surrender of Japan are the supreme law for us.

These measures for the suppression of an aggressor

taken in effectuation of the said decisions, can in no way justify ex post facto the actions of Japan and are not subject to criticism and impeachment. This simple contention does not need any special proof. In fact, it meant, I would venture to say, the return to the question of the Tribunal's jurisdiction, to the questioning of its right to hear this case; but now it is being done, not in a direct way (this way was already repeatedly denied to the defense) but in a roundabout way. However, this does not make the allegation of the defense more convincing, and should be rejected, as was done before.

Therefore I ask the Tribunal to reject this document and to point out to the defense that the question of the joint actions of the USA, Great Britain, and the USSR, including preparation for these actions, which were taken for suppression of Japan as an aggressor and for the establishment of general peace, is irrelevant to the issues in this case, and that documents dealing with this subject should not be tendered.

W h 8 1 e & S e 1

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. LR. BLAKENEY: Language section, have you my argument for simultaneous reading? THE MONITOh: Yes, we do. Proceed please. 4 MR. BLAKENEY: You have? THE MONITOR: Yes. 6 MR. BLAKENEY: There are several different matters touched upon in the document now presented, leaving out of question the argument about documents not yet presented, and I shall discuss these points seriatim, submitting to the Tribunal that the evidence 12 on each of them is relevant to the issues. First, Soviet assurances regarding observance 13 14 of the Neutrality Pact. The defendants, all of them, 15 are charged by Counts 4 and 5 of the indictment with 16 conspiring to wage, and by Count 17 with having between 17 the first of January 1928 and the 2 September 1945 18 planned and prepared, a war of agression, in violation of, 19 inter alia, certain assurances, against the U.S.S.R. 20 The concept of imposing criminal responsibility for 21 violation of an assurance, a unilateral pronouncement, is a novel one. We may test the validity of this pro-23 posed principle of international law by seeing whether the U.S.S.R. itself, the nation complainant, has in this bame matter treated assurances as binding on the nation

making them. Evidence later to be adduced will show that the Soviet assurances that the U.S.S.R. maintained strict neutrality in the war between Japan and the United States and Britain, assurances that the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact governed the U.S.S.R.'s attitude in dealings with Japan, and assurances that after the denunciation of the Pact the U.S.S.R. would observe it according to its terms until its expiration date, were then false and were all subsequently disregarded and violated by the U.S.S.R.

Second, the question of Soviet mediation in the Pacific war. The same Counts of the indictment above referred to charge the defendants with planning and preparing a war of aggression against the U.S.S.R. down to 2 September 1945. That Japan had pending with the U.S.S.R. from July 1945 to 9 August 1945, when hostilities commenced, a request for mediation, or use of good offices, for termination of the Pacific war, must be convincing evidence that, at that time Japan entertained no aggressive designs against the U.S.S.R. It is, moreover, quite apparent from the diplomatic correspondence relating to the mediation question later to be offered, that Japan was expecting and was prepared to pay to the U.S.S.R. for the services to be rendered by way of acceptance of various Soviet claims in Far Eastern

-

questions. Acceptance of Soviet claims could have meant only that so far from planning aggression, Japan was suppliant for peace even at great price.

Loreover, the defendants being charged with waging a war of aggression against the United States of America and others to 2 September 1945, this evidence is relevant as showing that some of them, the defendants, at all events were at this time attempting to put an end to the waging of war. In this connection, it is supposed that only those can be said to be waging a war who are during the progress of the war occupying some office connected with the conduct of the war and are supporting its continuation; one in such an office who is utilizing his office for the purpose of attempting to bring the war to an end would not be waging it in this sense. This evidence would have relevance if only in mitigation; for it will corroborate testimony later to be given, by defendants themselves, that certain of them had been working for termination of the war at the earliest opportunity, and that this was the earliest opportunity.

Thirdly, on the Soviet declaration of war against Japan. Very much was made in the presentation of the prosecution's case of the point alleged that a declaration of war was not served by Japan upon the United States and

8

63

14

11

12

13

4

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

23,572

SATO DIRECT

other countries in accordance with the provisions of
The Hague Convention III. There can be, surely, no
more significant enswer to the question of the binding
character of this provision of The Hague Convention then
whether its mandate was or was not submitted to by one
of the very nations now seeking to enforce it, in its
commencement of hostilities against the nation whose
statesmen and soldiers are now on trial for the violation.
Surely nothing could be more relevant.

I leave wholly out of consideration here the question, which has perhaps been sufficiently argued before now, of trenties' ceasing to have validity by reason of their non-observance by the members of the community of nations. Quite aside from that, it must be apparent that the offer by the U.S.S.R. to charge and condemn Japan for an action which, as the evidence tendered and to follow will show, was precisely the course of conduct of the U.S.S.k. itself in analogous circumstances, but at another time, that this offer is abhorrent to every principle of equity or justice.

Inherent in the prosecution's case also was the reasoning that the defendants were guilty of the international crime of launching upon war of aggression by reason of having, as it was alleged, brought about wars and attacked other nations without having just cause

1 2

.

other countries in accordance with the provisions of
The Hague Convention III. There can be, surely, no
more significant enswer to the question of the binding
character of this provision of The Hague Convention then
whether its mandate was or was not submitted to by one
of the very nations now seeking to enforce it, in its
commencement of hostilities against the nation whose
statesmen and soldiers are now on trial for the violation.
Surely nothing could be more relevant.

I leave wholly out of consideration here the question, which has perhaps been sufficiently argued before now, of trenties' dessing to have validity by reason of their non-observance by the members of the community of nations. Quite aside from that, it must be apparent that the offer by the U.S.S.R. to charge and condemn Japan for an action which, as the evidence tendered and to follow will show, was precisely the course of conduct of the U.S.S.k. itself in analogous circumstances, but at another time, that this offer is abhorrent to every principle of equity or justice.

Inherent in the prosecution's case also was the reasoning that the defendants were guilty of the international crime of launching upon war of aggression by reason of having, as it was alleged, brought about wars and attacked other nations without having just cause

therefor. If this is to be the principle of international law, it must be because it is recognized and accepted as such by the members of the community of nations, and especially the dominant ones, those represented by the prosecuting nations here. If the U.S.S.k. is to be heard saying that it accepts and will enforce the principle that a war undertaken without just cause is a crime of the nation undertaking it and of its leaders, the defendants must be heard rebutting that contention by the proof of the conduct of the U.S.S.R. toward their own nation in the same war. If the evidence shows, as it will show, that the Soviet Union had not nor professed to have any cause for initiating a war against Japan except the request of its allies that it do so, it becomes an interesting speculation how the prosecuting nations can be said to have recognized such a principle of international law.

objections to this testimony is one to which I must say the prosecution has of late seemed very prone -- while apparently conceding or at any rate passing without comment the question of the truth of the facts to be proved, he says that this is an attempt at unilaterally disputing the facts well known to the world. He says that there can be no other opinion than that the acts of

2

1

4

5

U

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23 24

the U.S.S.R. and its allies, of which my own nation is one, are right and correct. This has not the sound of argument addressed to a Tribunal. I do not detect in it argument on the question of the relevance of evidence, rather, it sounds like the implication that some force majeure is to exclude evidence which may be relevant. I submit that the very concepts of courts and judges and evidence means that whatever evidence is relevant will be heard from both sides, even if one side is the sovereign.

I, therefore, submit that as against the various political declarations referred to by Mr.

Prosecutor, this evidence is strongly relevant to the issues of this case as I have hereinbefore pointed out and the affidevit should be admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court will consider the metter.

We will recess now until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1150, a recess was taken.)

1430.

1

2

B

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

NAOTAKE SATO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: The Court has come to its decision upon the document last tendered. The Tribunal thinks that evidence of Russia's entry into the war is irrelevant because there is no charge against any of the accused in respect of his conduct following such entry, or if there is any such charge there is no evidence to support it.

The affidavit tendered will be admitted except as to paragraph 10 thereof, which will be struck out in view of our decision.

That decision may need or require a revision of other documents to be tendered.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1545

23 24

# AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1430.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

NAOTAKE SATO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. BLAKENRY:

THE PRESIDENT: The Court has come to its decision upon the document last tendered. The Tribunal thinks that evidence of Russia's entry into the war is irrelevant because there is no charge against any of the accused in respect of his conduct following such entry, or if there is any such charge there is no evidence to support it.

The affidavit tendered will be admitted except as to paragraph 10 thereof, which will be struck out in view of our decision.

That decision may need or require a revision of other documents to be tendered.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1545

arton & Spratt

В

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

10

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

21

20

22

23 24

will receive exhibit No. 2695.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit
No. 2695 and received in evidence.)

3

4

6

8

9

11

13

15

17 18

19

21

20

22

24

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the document as admitted by the Tribunal, omitting the formal parts thereof:

"1. I was Ambassador to the Soviet Union from March 1942 until the outbroak of war between Japan and the U.S.S.R in August 1945, and am at present President of the Foreign Ministry's Training Institute in Tokyo.

request concerning the arming of fishing-craft as a defensive measure, Vice-Minister Lozovsky on 3 June, in saying that the Soviet Government did not wish armed merchant vessels to enter Soviet ports, stated that the USSR maintained strict neutrality in the war between Japan and the United States and Britian. A written protest lodged by Zhukev, Director of the Social Bureau of Far Eastern affairs of the Soviet Foreign Office, with KAMEYAMA, Counseller of the Embassy, on 27 June, concerning the arming of the Kanza Maru, a Japanese tanker engaged in the transport of oil stocked in Northern Sakhalin, contained the positive statement that the Soviet Government maintained such neutrality.

"3. On 19 July 1944, at a conversation concerning Japanese-German and Anglo-American-Soviet relations, I stated that the Japanese Government was determined to maintain a faithful attitude of neutrality in future as in the past, and had the expectation of a similar attitude from the USSR. Lozovsky replied to the effect that the government of the U S S R at all times took the existence of the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact into consideration, and acted in accordance with it in dealing with all problems.

"4. On 16 September 1944, in the course of a conversation on the China question, I requesting confirmation of the Soviet Union's neutrality in the Sino-Japanese hostilities, Foreign Minister Molotov replied that there was no change in the U S S R's relations with Chungking. He further stated that Soviet-Japanese relations were in a normal condition, and even tending toward the better.

"5. On 17 November 1944 I said that while it was assumed that the question of Siberian bases must have been discussed at the Anglo-American-Soviet Moscow Conference, nevertheless, it was expected that the U S S R would offer confirmation that there was no change in its attitude toward Japan. In reply, Molotov said that the Siberian base question was by no means new, having come up for discussion even before the Moscow Conference, but that the policy of the Soviet

2

1

3

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

7 8

Union was clear from the fact that Marshal Stalin, in his address of 6 November, had made no reference to any change in Soviet policy toward Japan.

eign Minister Molotov whether the Yalta Conference had dealt with Far-Eastern questions, to which Molotov replied that the result of the conference was as had been published, and that the discussion was limited almost wholly to European problems, with some discussion of post-war questions, but that Far-Eastern questions had been entirely excluded. Soviet-Japanese relations, he pointed out, were a matter exclusively between the U S S R and Japan, who maintained relations of neutrality; whereas, Anglo-American-Japanese relations were a matter concerning those powers exclusively, they being in a state of war.

"7. At various times from 22 February 1945
I had discussions with Molotov or Lozovsky concerning
the Neutrality Pact, expressing the desire of the
Government of Japan that it be continued in force and
requesting a similar statement of the U.S.S.R. On
5 April Molotov, receiving me, stated that he was about
to convey the statement of the Soviet Government of
the question, and read a memorandum notifying the
Japanese Government of the Soviet denunciation of the

Neutrality Pact as of its expiration date, 25 April 1946, I, inquiring what attitude would be adopted by the U S S R during the remaining period of the Pact, Molotov replied that the intertion of the Soviet Government was to return, after the expiration of the Pact, to the conditions prevailing before its execution; that the Soviet denunciation was made in accordance with the provisions of the Pact itself, but that needless to say, it was only after the expiration of the full term of five years that conditions were to revert to the status quo ante; and that the outbreak of the Russo-German and Japanese-Anglo-American wars after signature of the Pact had altered conditions, and that the Soviet Government's reasons for abrogation were clearly expressed in the prepared statement. I said that the statement was received with regret, and that the government of Japan hoped to have the former relations continued, and the peace of the Far Last remain undisturbed as before, even after the denunciation of the Pact. Molotov replied that, as to conditions after the denunciation, it was recognized that the Pact continued in force for another year, and that the attitude of the Soviet Government would be determined by this condition.

"8. I had numerous conferences with officials of the

2

1

4

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

25

Foreign Office concerning the landing of American military planes in the territory of the USSA. There were three such cases before the end of 1943: on 18 April 1942, one plane; on 12 August 1943, one plane; and on 12 September 1943, seven planes. In reply to the inquiries which I made on those occasions the government of the Soviet Union replied that proper measures were being taken in accordance with the provisions of international law. In 1944 there were numerous such instances; although they were not puplished, I was informed by Molotov, Lozovsky and Zhukov, that two planes had landed on 15 June, and one on 21 June. Inquiries were made concerning these cases and others of which we had word, the reply being given by Lozovsky on 29 August that in all such cases the government of the U S S R would act in accordance with the provisions of international law, and would furnish to the Japanese Government all information which the Soviet Government might acquire in connection with such cases. No information was ever given thereafter, nor were replies given to inquiries concerning landings reported to have occurred on 20 August, 18 November, and other dates. On 13 December Lozovsky said, upon being pressed for a reply, that the American bembers must be missing, as no report had been received from the re-

DIRECT

sponsible authorities.

"9. The history of my efferts to secure Soviet mediation in the Pacific war at the direction of Foreign Minister TOGO is contained in the telegrams, Defense Documents Nos. 1465, 1467, 1468 and 1469, addressed to me from the Foreign Minister, and Defense Documents Nos. 1466, 1470, 1471, 1472, 1473 and 1474, sent by me to the Foreign Minister, which I verify as respectively correct copies of telegrams received and as true relations of what occurred in connection with this matter.

"11. In passing through Manchuria in March
1942, enroute to my post in Kuibishev, I had conversations with various friends, including General UMEZU,
Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, and some of
his high staff-officers. I told them that it was most
important that the Kwantung Army should take no action
which could be construed as aggressive toward the
U S S R or could give them provocation in any way.
General UMEZU and others agreed with my opinion, and
General UMEZU told me that all dispositions of the
Kwantung Army were defensive and that from the Kwantung
Army there would be no manifestations of an aggressive
attitude.

"12. Prior to the Soviet declaration of war

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

on Japan there had been in March 1944 a settlement of the Fisheries Convention question by extension of the convention for five years, and simultaneously a settlement of the troublesome Northern Sakhalin petroleum concessions question by Japan's relinquishment of its concession there. No protest was ever made during my tenure as Ambassador against the maintenarce of Japanese forces in Manchoukuo and Korea or along the Soviet border; and although border incidents were numercus during that time, they were very minor, involving only a few soldiers at a time, and no serious disputes ever developed from them. With removal of the longstanding sources of friction mentioned above, relations between the two countries during my tenure were good and bordering on the cordial, and no question was pending in August 1945 to suggest the possibility of an outbreak of war."

18

16

17

19

20

21 22

23

24

23,584

SATO DIRECT

I wish now to tender for identification the telegrams identified in paragraph 9 of the affidavit of this witness, being defense documents enumerated as follows: No. 1465, No. 1469, No. 1466, No. 1470, No. 1468, No. 1467, No. 1471, only.

In the interest of saving time I offer these as a group.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VISILIEV: Your Honor, I object to the introduction of these documents, as to these documents is applied the decision which has just been taken by the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we have not read them to see whether our decision has been complied with or not.

PR. BLAKENEY: These documents relate exclusively to the question of the Japanese effort to secure Soviet mediation in the Pacific War, and to no other question.

THE PRESIDENT: They do not bear upon Russia's entry into the war?

MR. BLAKENEY: They do not.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, these

2

1

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

documents undoubtedly bear upon the entry of Russia into the war.

DIRECT

THE PRESIDENT: An individual accused may have been shown to have taken part in this approach? Is that so?

MA. BLAKENEY: That is so.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, apart from that, what is their relevance, Major Blakeney?

MR. BLAKENEY: The relevance of these documents is the same as that which I argued prior to the noon recess; that is to say, to paraphrase briefly, the section of the argument which related specifically to these documents, that they are relevant as the negation of an aggressive intent or plans for aggression by the defendants against the USSR during the period after July, 1945.

charged by us with the aggression, aggressive intentions after July, 1945. I understand the decision taken by the Tribunal, that the decision deals with the participation of the Soviet Union in the war, not in a narrow sense -- I understood the decision, not in a narrow sense, as meaning immediate participation in the war, but a system of measures which were carried out in accordance with the decisions taken

The questions that were raised by Japan before the Soviet Union in 1945, the Soviet Union could only settle on the basis of the decisions taken at the Conferences of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. In this light the documents which are being presented undoubtedly have bearing upon the entry of the USSR into the war, and should be rejected in accordance with the decision of the Tribunal which has just been taken.

MR. BLAKENEY: May I add just one word.

I refer, without reading them, to counts

3 and 4 of the Indictment, and I read count 17,
which charges that "all the defendants between
the 1st January, 1928 and the 2nd September, 1945,
planned and prepared a war of aggression and a war
in violation of international law, treaties,
agreements and assurances, against the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics."

For counsel to state that no such charge is made must only show that he has not read his Indictment. The charge is repeated and elaborated in the opening address of Minister Golunsky, where he himself originally referred to this mediation question. The evidence now tendered is such as to

DIRECT 23,587

SATO

show that one defendant, at all events, was not at one time, between 1928 and the 2nd of September, 1945, planning a war of aggression against the USSR. It not only proves that specific fact, but it goes to disprove many of the allegations, some of them supported by evidence of the Soviet prosecution.

It seemed to me that the ruling of the Tribunal on the objection which was originally made as going against all these documents is quite clear, and there is no occasion for repeating objection on different grounds to each of these documents.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, it is the first time that I hear that the defense deny the prosecution the right of objection to the documents presented. I fully rely upon the ruling of the Tribunal, but not on the opinion of the defense. Our point of view as to the mediation of the USSR in the war was clearly stated in Prosecutor Golunsky's speech, and I am in full agreement with it.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled, and the documents admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1465 will receive exhibit No. 2696; defense document 1469

will be given exhibit No. 2697; defense document

1466 will be given exhibit No. 2698; defense document 1470 will be given exhibit No. 2699; defense
document 1468 will receive exhibit No. 2700;
defense document 1467 will be given exhibit No.
2701; and defense document 1471 will receive
exhibit No. 2702.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked defense exhibits Nos. 2696, 2697, 2698, 2699, 2700, 2701, and 2702, respectively, and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for ten

(Whereupon, at 1500, a recess was taken until 1510, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Wolf & Kaplea

u

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: In connection with the ruling of the Tribunal delivered before the recess, I should like to call attention to the following: that whereas by Count 53 of the Indictment and Count 55 certain named defendants are charged with conspiracy to commit conventional war crimes against nations, including the USSR, the period of time included dates to the 2nd of September, 1945.

Prosecution exhibit 2164, at record page 15,491, and the affidavit of the witness Romanov, prosecution exhibit 2165, at page 15,494 of the record, relate to atrocities allegedly committed against Soviet nationals, the first on the 9th and the second on the 19th of August, 1945, or after the entry of the Soviet Union into the war.

THE PRESIDENT: We spoke of the conduct of the accused as a result of Pussia's entry into the war. The atrocities are not the result of Russia's entry into the war, I take it, or the alleged atrocities. You had better proceed to read your documents, Major.

MR. BLAKENEY: Very well. I merely wish

2

3

5

8

9

11

12

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

to point that out in view of the Tribunal's ruling.

I am advised by the Clerk that through inadvertence I failed to offer all the documents in question. I therefore wish to add to my offer defense documents 1472, 1473, and 1474, being the continuation of the series of telegrams relating to the same subject matter, and I ask that they be admitted likewise. May they also be admitted, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection?
Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1472 will receive exhibit No. 2703. Defense document 1473 will be given exhibit No. 2704. Defense document 1474 will receive exhibit No. 2705.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked, respectively, defense exhibits 2703, 2704, and 2705, and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read exhibit 2696, being a telegram to Ambassador SATO at Moscow from Foreign Minister TOGO, dated 12 July 1945:

"With reference to my telegram No. 891, et al.

"Having received no report on your interview with Molotov, I feel like one marching out troops without sufficient reconsissance, but it is considered proper to convey to the Soviet Union, prior to the commencement of the Three-Power Conference, the Imperial wish to end the war. I hope that you will make explanation to the following effect directly to Molotov:

"His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, being solicitous over the increasing calamity and damage of the war to the belligerent countries, desires that the war should promptly be brought to an end. Nevertheless, so long as Britain and the United States adhere to the demand for Japan's unconditional surrender in the Greater East Asia "ar, there is no other way for Japan but to fight through the war at all hazards for the honor and existence of the country. It is much against our will to shed more blood of belligerent nations for that reason. His Majesty hopes to restore peace as soon as possible for the sake of the happiness of mankind.

"The above Imperial wishes are rooted, not only in His Majesty's benevolence to his subjects, but in his hearty desire for the happiness of mankind, and he intends to dispatch Prince KONOE Fumimaro as special envoy to the Soviet Union, bearing his personal letter. You are directed,

1. 2

therefore, to convey this to Molotov, and promptly obtain from the Soviet Government admission into that country for the special envoy and his suite. (The list of members of the special envoy's suite will be cabled later.) Further, though it is not 5 possible for the special envoy to reach Moscow before the Russian authorities leave there for the Three-Power Conference, arrangements must be made 8 so that the special envoy may meet them as soon as 9 they return to Moscow. It is desired, therefore, that the special envoy and his suite make the trip by plane. You will request the Soviet Covernment to 13 send an airplane for them as far as Manchouli or 14 Tsitsihar." 15

I read exhibit 2697, a telegram of the 13th of July, 1945, from Foreign Minister TOGO to Ambassador SATO:

"Reference to my telegram No. 893.

"It was considered proper that I should receive Ambassador Malik and convey the intended dispatch of the special envoy, but as Malik was ill abed, I sent ANDO, Director of the Bureau of Political Affairs, to convey to the Ambassador that His Majesty desired to dispatch Prince KONOE as special envoy, carrying with him the personal letter of His

1 2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

Majesty stating the Imperial wish to end the war; that you were to convey the matter to the Soviet Government; and that the Ambassador should concurrently accord facilities in this connection. Ambassador Malik promised to telegraph promptly about the matter to his Government."

Exhibit 2698 is a telegram from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO, dated the 13th of July.

(Reading):

"Reference to my telegram No. 1383.

"Although I promptly asked Molotov for an interview, he replied to the effect that, as circumstances would by no possibility admit of a meeting, I should discuss the matter with Lozovsky. Thereupon, I met Lozovsky at 5 P.M. on the 13th, and presented His Majesty's wishes, contained in your telegram No. 893, translated into Russian, together with my confidential letter addressed to Molotov, asking Lozovsky to transmit them, after perusal, to Molotov without delay. The letter referred to the Imperial wish to dispatch Prince KONOE, mentioned in your telegram, and asked that the Soviet Government give assent to the visit of the Prince and kindly afford conveniences to the Japanese Government by placing an aeroplane at its service.

"I explained, on that occasion, that the special envoy Japan is now intending to send, being dispatched in accordance with His Majesty's wishes, is quite different in character from those projected envoys in the past who were successively submitted

Exhibit 2698 is a telegram from Ambassador FATO to Foreign Minister TOGO, dated the 13th of July.

(Reading):

"Reference to my telegram No. 1383.

"Although I promptly asked Molotov for an interview, he replied to the effect that, as circumstances would by no possibility admit of a meeting, I should discuss the matter with Lozovsky. Thereupon, I met Lozovsky at 5 P.M. on the 13th, and presented His Majesty's wishes, contained in your telegram No. 893, translated into Russian, together with my confidential letter addressed to Molotov, asking Lozovsky to transmit them, after perusal, to Molotov without delay. The letter referred to the Imperial wish to dispatch Prince KONOE, mentioned in your telegram, and asked that the Soviet Government give assent to the visit of the Prince and kindly afford conveniences to the Japanese Government by placing an aeroplane at its service.

"I explained, on that occasion, that the special envoy Japan is now intending to send, being dispatched in accordance with His Majesty's wishes, is quite different in character from those projected envoys in the past who were successively submitted

.20

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

from Berlin.

to Molotov, and expressed our desire that the Soviet Government should fully understand this point. I added that the Japanese Government, being anxious to obtain the consent, in principle at least, of the Soviet Government in this matter, hoped to receive the reply before the departure of Molotov, and to make arrangements so that the special envoy meet the Soviet authorities as soon as they returned

"As Lozovsky asked to whom the message of the Emperor was directed, I answered that, though the message was not addressed to any special person for the reason that it conveyed the Imperial wishes, we hoped that it would be transmitted to Kalinin. the head of the Soviet Government, Stalin, Chairman of the Board of People's Commissars, and Molotov. Lozovsky stated that he understood the reasons why the Japanese Government was in such haste and wished to urgo the reply of the Soviet Government in compliance with Japan's desire, but that it was practically impossible to make a reply prior to the departure of Molotov as a part of the Russian delegation was expected to leave that very evening. I thereupon expressed my desire that, inasmuch as the preparations had to be made for the dispatch of the special envoy

5

4

7 8

9

11

13

14

16

19

18

22

21

23 24

25

and his suite, the reply be given on consultation with Berlin by telephone or other means if it was impossible to reply before Molotov's departure.

Lozovsky answered me that he intended to arrange it as I desired, and promised to hand to Molotov immediately the documents I carried.

"I hasten to make report as above."

I now read exhibit 2699, being a telegram of the 19th of July from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO.

"Reference to my telegram No. 1385.

"In the evening of the 18th, I received a confidential letter from Lozovsky which runs as follows:

"At Moscow, 18 July 1945

"His Excellency, SATO Naotake, etc.

"Excellency:

"I have the honor to confirm hereby that
I am in receipt of your letter under date of 13 July,
and the message from His Majesty the Emperor of
Japan.

"I have the honor to call your attention, by order of the Government of the U.S.S.R., to the fact that the Imperial wish stated in the message of the Emperor of Japan is general in form and contains

no concrete proposal. The mission of Special Envoy Prince KONOE is also uncertain to the Government of the U.S.F.R.

"The Government of the U.r.r.R., accordingly, is unable to give any definite reply as to either the message of the Emperor of Japan or the dispatch of Special Envoy Prince KONOE mentioned in your letter under date of 13 July.

"I avail myself of this opportunity", etc.
I now read exhibit No. 2700, a letter of

the 21st of July to Ambassador FATO from Foreign Minister TOGO.

"With reference to your telegrams Nos. 1417 and 1418.

"The mission of Special Envoy Prince KONOE consists of requesting the Soviet Government, in conformity with the Imperial wishes, to use its good offices to bring the war to an end; in stating the concrete intention of the Japanese Government thereon; and in consulting upon matters relating to the establishment of cooperative relations between Japan and the Soviet Union, which should be the foundation of Japan's foreign policy throughout the war period as well as the post-bellum period.

"You will convey the above to the Soviet

Government and strive to obtain its consent to the dispatch of the Special Envoy.

"It is further desired that you fully understand my telegram No. 932."

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. BLAKENEY: No. 932 is exhibit No. 2701 from foreign minister TOGO to ambassador SATO, the 21st of July 1945 which I now read. (Reading)

"Reference to my telegram No. 931.

We cannot accept unconditional surrender in any circumstances (your telegram No. 1476 is appreciated). It is obvious that, if the war be protracted, more blood will be shed by both sides, yet the Japanese nation will rise as one man against the enemy if it persistently demand unconditional surrender. But we intend, in conformity with the Imperial wishes, to bring about through the good offices of the Soviet Union a peace which is not the so-called unconditional surrender, with a view to averting the coming about of such a situation. It is necessary to make all possible efforts to cause Britain and the United States clearly to understand the above-mentioned intention of Japan. We cannot, therefore, ask the Soviet Union to use its good offices without attaching any condition; at the same time, it would also be impossible as well as disadvantageous, in view of the domestic situation as well as external relations, to set forth concrete terms of peace immediately now. In such delicate circumstances, Prince Konoe shall convey to the Soviet Government the concrete intention of Japan based upon the Imperial wishes, and after giving full

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consideration to the Russian demands in East Asia, he shall request the Soviet Government after consultation to negotiate with Britain and the United States. "2) --THE Phesident: Mr. blokeney, we do not appear to have that. At least some of us, including myself, have not a copy of what you are reading. kk. pLAKERLY: I am sorry, sir, may I ask the clerk whether copies are available? CLERK OF THE COURT: They were mixed in with enother document number. Mr. LLAKENEY: Perhaps we can assemble enough copies here if we may learn how many are missing. THE P. ESIDERT: Most of us ore without copies of them. I suppose you better proceed to reed the next document. MR. BLAKEMEY: Very well then I will postpone this until tomorrow morning. THE PARSIDERT: Well, read the belonce of it now. ah. BLAKEREY: Very well. (Reading) "2) In smuch as the present negotiations are

of such importance as to involve the destiny of Japan,

you should take all possible steps to find out the true

intention of the Soviet Union, seeking, for instance,

full explanation of the Russian reply transmitted in your telegrem No. 1417. 2 "3) You should make it clear, if necessary, that this special envoy is to be dispatched expressly 4 by the benevolent wish of His Majesty, though of course the Government, in assisting the Emperor, is responsi-

ble for the matter. You should, further, insure that Prince Konoe's enjoyment of His Majesty's confidence, and also his distinguished position in our political

circles, be impressed upon the Soviet Union.

"4) As regards the proposal in the reference telegram No. 931, it is requested that it should not be made in writing, unless absolutely necessary.

"5) lappreciate your opinion submitted in telegram no. 1417, but, since there has been decision by the highest authorities to the effect contained in the reference telegrem, your further efforts are requested."

THE PRESIDENT: Defense documents Nos. 1467 and 1472 bear the same exhibit number sccording to the documents before us, namely, exhibit No. 2701. This 1472 should be 2703.

Mr. BLAKENLY: I now come to exhibit No. 2702 and I propose to read it, if the Tribunal please; this being a telegram from ambassador SATO to foreign minister

1

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

full explanation of the Russian reply transmitted in your telegram No. 1417.

"3) You should make it clear, if necessary

"3) You should make it clear, if necessary, that this special envoy is to be dispatched expressly by the benevolent wish of His Majesty, though of course the Government, in assisting the Emperor, is responsible for the matter. You should, further, insure that Prince Konoe's enjoyment of His Majesty's confidence, and also his distinguished position in our political circles, be impressed upon the Soviet Union.

"4) As regards the proposal in the reference telegram No. 931, it is requested that it should not be made in writing, unless absolutely necessary.

"5) I appreciate your opinion submitted in telegram No. 1417, but, since there has been decision by the highest authorities to the effect contained in the reference telegram, your further efforts are requested."

THE PRESIDENT: Defense documents Nos. 1467 and 1472 bear the same exhibit number according to the documents before us, namely, exhibit No. 2701. This 1472 should be 2703.

MR. BLAKENEY: I now come to exhibit No. 2702 and I propose to read it, if the Tribunal please; this being a telegram from ambassador SATO to foreign minister

1 2

....

-

TOGO on the 25 July 1945. (needing)

"Reference to my telegram No. 1441.

"I met Lozovsky on the 25th and made the statement in my separate telegram No. 1450. Subsequently, there were questions and answers as follows:

"SATO: As I have just stated, the Japanese Government seeks the good offices of the Soviet Government in order to bring the war to an end, and intends to have frince Konoe explain the Government's concrete intentions in connection therewith directly to the Soviet Government. I hope that you will understand this point.

"LOZOVSKY: May I have the text of your present statement? The content of the statement is very important, and the written statement will be greatly conducive to exact understanding of it by this Government; precise understanding cannot be expected from the oral statement only. Moreover, it I can have it in written form, it will be convenient for my reporting to my government.

"There are a few questions which I should like to ask. I understand that (1) the Japanese Government is asking for the United States and Dritain, and (2) that Prince Konoe is to carry some concrete proposal in this connection. But it is not clear whether the very

7 8

TOGO on the 25 July 1945. (needing)

"Reference to my telegram No. 1441.

"I met Lozovsky on the 25th and made the statement in my separate telegram No. 1450. Subsequently, there were questions and answers as follows:

"SATO: As I have just stated, the Japanese Government seeks the good offices of the Soviet Government in order to bring the war to an end, and intends to have Frince Konoe explain the Government's concrete intentions in connection therewith directly to the Soviet Government. I hope that you will understand this point.

"LOZOVSKY: May I have the text of your present statement? The content of the statement is very important, and the written statement will be greatly conducive to exact understanding of it by this Government; precise understanding cannot be expected from the oral statement only. Moreover, it I can have it in written form, it will be convenient for my reporting to my government.

"There are a few questions which I should like to ask. I understand that (1) the Japanese Government is asking for the United States and Dritain, and (2) that Prince Konoe is to carry some concrete proposal in this connection. But it is not clear whether the very

.21

proposal is connected with the ending of war or with the improvement and strengthening of Russo-Japanese relations. I should like to have this point explained so that I may report it to the Government.

"SATO: To enswer the first point, the concrete intention of the Japanese Government which Prince Konoe is to lay before your Government is connected, as I understand, with both of the problems you have just mentioned. It is connected on the one hand with the request for the good offices of the Soviet Government, and on the other with the question of the improvement and strengthening of Russo-Japanese relations. In the next place, though it goes beyond the limits of the instructions I have received, I will put what I have stated today in writing for your reference and submit it to you later on my own responsibility, in the light of the importance of the matter which you have pointed out, and in consideration of the sect that the high authorities of the Soviet government are now in Berlin. But, in view of the delicate nature of the question, I desire that the document be kept strictly confidential until the reply is given by the Soviet Government.

"It is believed, I should like to edd, that there is no mistake in considering, in the light of the deep confidence of His Majesty the Emperor which Prince

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15 16

17

19

20

22

25

honoe enjoys and the distinguished position which he holds in political circles in Japan, that his mission is to cover a wide scope, including asking the government of the Soviet Union for its good offices and exchanging views in order to facilitate solution of questions between Japan and the Soviet Union and going further into the future relations between the two countries.

"LOZOVSKY: I fully understand the delicate nature of the question and also that your proposel should be treated strictly confidentially. The matter will be reported to the Government as soon as your written statement is sent to me, and the instructions from the Government will be conveyed to you as soon as they are received.

"SATO: I appreciate your kindness. I do hope personally, not to mention officially, that a prompt reply will be obtained.

"(On leaving, I added as follows:)

"As regards the mission of Prince Konoe, the objective of the Japanese Government is to ask for the good offices of the Soviet overnment to bring the war to a termination. Since the objective is good, I hope you will kindly endervor to persuade the Soviet Government to hear this directly from Prince Konoe.

1 2

"Today's conversation was as above. I made repeated explanations about the mission of the special envoy, and I think I have succeeded in making a considerable impression upon Lozovsky. Especially the point that the Japanese Government asked for the good offices of the Soviet Government seems to have arrested Lozovsky attention. He listened to me with an eager and polite attitude throughout the interview, and promised to give the answer of the Soviet Government."

I now come to exhibit 2703, a telegram of the 25th of July from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO:

"Reference to my telegram No. 1449,

"In the interview with Lozovsky on 25 July, I made the following oral statement (it was, however, arranged, as reported in my telegram No. 1449, to send it later in writing to Lozovsky).

"1. On the occasion of my interview with the Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs on 13
July, I handed to him the message of His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, and conveyed simultaneously the Imperial wish to dispatch Prince KONOE as Special Envoy to the Soviet Union. I received, on 18 July, his written reply to the effect that, as there was stated in the Imperial message nothing concrete as to the mission of the special envoy to be dispatched to Moscow, the Soviet Government was not able to give a definite reply.

"2. With a view to clarifying the situation in this connection, I should like to make the following statement.

"The mission of Special Envoy Prince KONOL, who is to be dispatched in accordance with the wishes of His Majestythe Emperor of Japan, consists of requesting the Soviet Government to use its good offices to

.....

I now come to exhibit 2703, a telegram of the 25th of July from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO:

"Reference to my telegram No. 1449,

"In the interview with Lozovsky on 25 July, I made the following oral statement (it was, however, arranged, as reported in my telegram No. 1449, to send it later in writing to Lozovsky).

"1. On the occasion of my interview with the Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs on 13
July, I handed to him the message of His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, and conveyed simultaneously the Imperial wish to dispatch Prince KONOE as Special Envoy to the Soviet Union. I received, on 18 July, his written reply to the effect that, as there was stated in the Imperial message nothing concrete as to the mission of the special envoy to be dispatched to Moscow, the Soviet Government was not able to give a definite reply.

"2. With a view to clarifying the situation in this connection, I should like to make the following statement.

"The mission of Special Envoy Prince KONOL, who is to be dispatched in accordance with the wishes of His Majestythe Emperor of Japan, consists of requesting the Soviet Government to use its good offices to

\*\*\*

8

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

bring the war to an end; in laying before that Government the concrete intention of the Japanese Government
in connection therewith; and, at the same time, in
consulting with it about the improvement and strengthening of Russo-Japanese relations, which are to be the
foundation of Japan's foreign policy throughout the war
period as well as the post-bellum period.

"3. In accordance with the instruction of the Japanese Government, I convey the above to the Soviet Government, and reiterate that it is by reason of the Imperial wish to prevent further bloodshed in the war that His Majesty ordered the Japanese Government to dispatch the special envoy, and that the mission of the special envoy is to set forth the concrete intention of the Japanese Government in this connection and request the consideration of the Soviet Government. I hope, therefore, that the Soviet Government will give kindly consideration to the present proposal, and will premptly give assent to the dispatch of the special envoy. I consider, further, that it is needless to say that ex-Premier Prince KONOE enjoys the confidence of His Majesty the Emperor, and holds a distinguished position in Japanese political circles, a fact well known to the Soviet Government."

I come now to exhibit No. 2704, a telegram from

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Ambassador. SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO of the 30th of July:

"Reference to my telegram No. 1476,

"Apprehending delay in the reply of the Soviet Government, I met Lozovsky at 5 p.m., 30 July, to convey our desire again, and had a colloquy as follows:

"SATO: I have come to see you in the hope that I may obtain the reply of the Soviet Government to the Japanese request, made on the 25th, that the Soviet Government should use its good offices to bring the war to an end. Though it has been arranged that you will let me know as soon as the reply is ready, I have ventured to call on you as it is today already Monday.

"LOZOVSKY: As both Stalin, Chairman of the Board of People's Commissars, and Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, are now in Berlin, it is unavoidable that it take some time before the reply is made. To our great regret, the reply is not yet ready.

"SATO: I fully understand the circumstances.

However, a joint declaration was published on the 26th

by the United States, Britain and China, demanding the

unconditional surrender of Japan. Unconditional surrender

however, is quite out of the question for the Japanese

Government.

"I have already told you this at our meeting

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

Ambassador. SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO of the 30th of July:

"Reference to my telegram No. 1476,

"Apprehending delay in the reply of the Soviet Government, I met Lozovsky at 5 n.m., 30 July, to convey our desire again, and had a colloquy as follows:

"SATO: I have come to see you in the hope that I may obtain the reply of the Soviet Government to the Japanese request, made on the 25th, that the Soviet Government should use its good offices to bring the war to an end. Though it has been arranged that you will let me know as soon as the reply is ready, I have ventured to call on you as it is today already Monday.

"LOZOVSKY: As both Stalin, Chairman of the Board of People's Commissars, and Molotov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, are now in Berlin, it is unavoidable that it take some time before the reply is made. To our great regret, the reply is not yet ready.

"SATO: I fully understand the circumstances.

However, a joint declaration was published on the 26th

by the United States, Britain and China, demanding the

unconditional surrender of Japan. Unconditional surrender

however, is quite out of the question for the Japanese

Government.

"I have already told you this at our meeting

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

22

23

24

before the last (on the 13th). Nevertheless, if that
formula can be avoided, Japan hopes to end the war on
broad terms of compromise, so long as its honor and
existence are guaranteed. This is why Japan has asked
for the services of the Government of the Soviet Union.
I hope that Chairman of the Board of People's Commissars
Stalin will give careful consideration to this point.
It cannot be helped if I do not receive a reply today,
but I wish that you would kindly tell Commissar Molotov
that I called upon you in expectation of obtaining the
reply today.

"LOZOVSKY: I will be sure to endeavor to convey your request to Molotov at the earliest possible opportunity." I shall not attempt the Russian phrase.

"SATO: I shall be much obliged if you will kindly do so. The Japanese Government is intending to dispatch Frince KONOE, who enjoys His Majesty's confidence as Special Envoy to Moscow, and, as I have stated in our previous interview, he is to carry on with the Soviet Government discussions of wise scope as to how the Japanese Government should establish anew the peace of the Far East, and to ask for the services of your Government in this connection. It is expected that the Soviet Government may have various requests and directions to make with regard to its services, and I understand that

12

14

16

15

18

19

21

23

Prince KONOE will be invested with broad authority in negotiating with the Soviet Government. It is hoped that you will also convey this point to Commissar Molotov.

"LOZOVSKY: I will comply with your request without delay.

"SATO: "het I fear is that the Three-Power
Joint Declaration may disturbe the Soviet Government
in using its good offices which the Japanese Government is asking for. The high authorities of the Soviet
Government are in Berlin now, and I expect that they
will give due consideration to the removal of such
obstacles.

"LOZOVSKY: I promise again that I will transmit your requests to them."

And lastly exhibit 2705, a telegram from Ambassador SATO to Foreign Minister TOGO dispatched on the 7th of August:

"Reference to my telegram 1419,

"I asked Molotov immediately after his return to Moscow for an interview, and asked Lozovsky also for his good offices in the matter. Molotov informed me on the 7th that he would be able to see me at 5 p.m. tomorrow, the 8th."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, we do not desire to cross-examine the witness.

MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be released on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BLAKENEY: The denunciation of the Neutrality Pact by the U.S.S.R. is in evidence as prosecution exhibit 54, read into the record at page 17,242. I should like to remind the Tribunal that in denouncing the Pact, Molotov mentioned to Ambassador SATO that since the execution of the Pact Germany had attacked the U.S.S.R and that Japan, the ally of Germany, was helping the latter in her war against the U.S.S.R.

I now offer in evidence as proof of Soviet violations of the Japan-U.S.S.R. Neutrality Fact and Russian preparations for aggression against Japan, defense document 1627, the affidavit of Major General John R. Deane.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, although the affiant has not been presented as a witness, the prosecution does not object to the introduction of the affidavit on that ground.

Objection is made to the affidavit, in its entirety, however, on the ground of relevancy and materiality.

between the Allied Powers and the U.S.S.R. from which it appears that the U.S.S.R. proposed to declare war on Japan within a designated time after the surrender of Germany. We submit that this evidence is covered by the Tribunal's ruling that evidence relating to the participation of the Soviet Union in the was is inadmissible. The last paragraph, No. 5, relates to entirely different subject matter which, we submit, should be rejected as irrelevant and immaterial.

I do not desire to take up the time of the Tribunal needlessly on the argument of the objection first made. If the Tribunal rules favorably on its previous ruling as being applicable, there would be no need for me to argue the objection. But I would like the privilege of arguing the objection if the first position is not sustained.

THE PRESIDENT: Suppose we are against you on the first ground. Is your second ground lengthy?

MR. TAVENNER: Not very lengthy. Probably ten minutes.

7 8

THE FRESIDENT: Vell, put your second ground. It will save time to do that.

in existence, that is at the time of the conference which is the subject of the testimony occurred, was an aggressive war on the part of the Japanese as charged in the Indictment, it can be no defense to the accused that the Allied Powers sought or acquired the assistance of another power or powers to resist the aggressor. With particular regard to the U.S.S.R., the Tribunal's attention is called to the fact that Courts 25 and 26 of the Indictment charge the initiation of war against the U.S.S.R. in 1938 and 1939, which was years before the conference in question occurred, so there can be no materiality or relevancy in this evidence as to these counts.

of war against the U.S.S.R. between the years 1928 and 1945, and the conspiracy counts cover the same period. But the evidence introduced by the prosecution of planning on the part of the accused is likewise prior to the alleged occurrence sought to be narrated in this affidavit. The prosecution has not introduced evidence of planning in 1944 or 1945 to wage war against the U.S.S.R.. The prosecution's evidence of planning the

war against the U.S.S.R. is related to periods much earlier than the conferences alleged in this affidavit to have taken place; wherein consider the Imperial conference of July 2, 1941, when a decision was reached that if conditions of the German-Soviet war progressed favorably to Japan, Japan would execute arms to solve the Northern problems.

We respectfully submit that the exidence tendered, in so far as it affects the U.S.S.R., is irrelevant and immaterial.

that the U.S.S.R. violated the neutrality pact, we submit that such an inquiry on the part of the Tribunal is not germane to the issues and is without the scope of the Tribunal's jurisdiction. The Tribunal is not called upon in these proceedings to determine the legal effect of the pact in the light of alleged Japanese aggression against the bilies of the U.S.S.R. then engaged with the U.S.S.R. in resisting Axis aggression. Neither is the Tribunal, we submit, called upon to weigh the factors involved in the decision by the U.S.S.R. to declare was against Japan and the matter of declaring was against Japan and the matter of violation of this pact are related subjects and it is respectfully submitted that the document.

2 8

```
should be rejected in its entirety.
1
            THE PRESIDENT: We will hear the defense
2
   tomorrow morning.
 3
            We will adjourn until half past nine tomorrow
4
   morning.
5
                  (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
6
        was taken until Thursday, 5 June 1947, at
7
        0930.)
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```